



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

not, is not clear) in violation of every imaginable criterion of Slavic linguistic history, one may mention in conclusion, as an example of the Aristophanic extremes to which such methods as those of Professor Wiener may bring a student, his assumption (p. 177) of formal relationship between "Slavic *gor-* 'burn'" and "Slavic *bēl-* 'white,'"—under the aegis, to be sure, of the protean "Eurasian root QVR."

L. B.

---

*THE SOLILOQUY IN GERMAN DRAMA*, by ERWIN W. ROESSLER. New York, Columbia University Press, 1915. 8vo.,

In six chapters: 'Early Indigenous Drama,' 'The Pseudo-Classical Drama,' "The Era of Lessing, Goethe, Schiller," "The Romantic Drama," "Forerunners of the Modern Realistic Drama," and "Recent Developments" this study attempts a complete survey of the soliloquy in theory and practice.

An ambitious undertaking, which, however, cannot be called a failure. There is industry, judgment, sound rather than keen, a businesslike sense of method, and robust, if not always strictly conventional, English.<sup>1</sup> To be sure, as with Miss Helmrich's study of the chorus<sup>2</sup> one might, for the earlier periods, call the supply of texts inadequate. But what is planned is, after all, I suppose, a survey, taking in representative plays and fixing on representative traits. As such this monograph yields valuable results.

Indeed, whoever looks first and foremost for philosophic analysis, minute and plentiful documentation and scientific caution in stating results, might easily be deceived by the breezy directness of this booklet and underestimate it. Thus the author recognizes only six types of soliloquies, whereas his predecessor in the field, Düssel<sup>3</sup> formally distinguished a good many more. Yet Mr. Roessler is fully aware of intermediary types and seldom fails to recognize them.

However, even if allowances be made, the critic balks at a number of points. A number of books, easy of access, should have been utilized: Rodewald on the *à part*, Mauermann and Zickel on stage directions, Bamberg on Goethe's use of the soliloquy.<sup>4</sup> Neither

<sup>1</sup> "The author's main concern was to get the story across," p. 21; "wrathy reflections," p. 43; "Ibsen's technic . . . was on a friendly footing with the soliloquy," p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> *The History of the Chorus in the German Drama*, by Elsie Winifred Helmrich. New York, Columbia University Press, 1912. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Jan. 1915.

<sup>3</sup> *Der dramatische Monolog in der Poetik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts und in den Dramen Lessings*, Hamburg-Leipzig, 1897.

<sup>4</sup> V. Rodewald, *Das à part im deutschen Schauspiel*, I, Heidelberg, 1908. M. Zickel, *Die scénarischen Bemerkungen im Zeitalter Gottscheds und Lessings*. Berlin, 1900. S. Mauermann, *Die Bühnenanweisungen im deutschen Drama bis 1700*. Berlin, 1911. W. Bamberg's, *Die Verwendung des Monologs in Goethes Dramen*. Leipzig-Hamburg, 1914 may have appeared too late.

would a reference to the soliloquies of the ancients have been amiss.<sup>5</sup> Maybe there was more to write about the "Marienklagen" and it might have been worth while to refer to the models of the "English" plays (p. 31 ff.). Schematic as the plan might be, something should have been said of the school-drama, especially in connection with Weise, whose whole activity is conditioned by it. Not a Hecastus-play is considered and there is no mention of Harsdörfer or Klaj, Hallman or Haugwitz, and no word about the operas. The libretto-writers probably agreed with Hunold-Ménantes<sup>6</sup> in condemning long soliloquies. The author takes Freytag rather too seriously (p. 8) and occasionally makes a too elastic use of the term soliloquy with reference to medieval church-plays (pp. 13, 21). The note on page 41 is confusing.

The chapters on Lessing, Schiller and Goethe commend themselves by their greater thoroughness. Incidentally, in the discussion of Lessing (p. 46) the relation between soliloquy and prologue or argument might have been examined as also, with regard to Goethe, Hettner's idea of monologues as substitutes for the chorus. However, indulgence in so many remarks and suggestions should not blind us to the solid merits of this monograph which, all considered, is a creditable piece of work.

Jos. E. GILLET.

*University of Illinois.*

---

**THE EVOLUTION OF TECHNIC IN ELIZABETHAN TRAGEDY.** By Harriett Ely Fansler, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English in the University of the Philippines. Published by Row, Peterson, and Company, Chicago and New York. 283 pages.

In an elaborate thesis presented for the doctorate at Columbia University, Dr. Fansler has attempted to find out "not what the critics have said that tragedies ought to be, but what tragedies have been"; to show "the progress of the Elizabethan playwrights in the structure of their pieces," particularly their conscious progress. The term "Elizabethan" is not used in its widest sense. The book deals with the plays of Shakespeare, principally, and with his predecessors, but does not touch upon the tragedies of Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, Chapman, or any of their successors. The exposition is sometimes labored; the definitions are slow in appearing and not altogether convincing. For instance, the closely related terms "crisis," "crisis-deed," and "crisis-emphasis" are used time and again before they are defined. Indeed, the meaning<sup>7</sup> of the term "crisis," which is understood by the author in a sense different from that generally accepted, is never definitely stated. It seems

<sup>5</sup> Fr. Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama*, Berlin, 1908.

<sup>6</sup> *Theatralische Gedichte*, 1706.